

and the Vice President that same afternoon and was at the White House by 5:30 p.m. that evening.

After White House processing, the bill was flown by helicopter to Andrews Air Force Base where an Air Force jet was waiting to fly to Uruguay. The joint resolution was signed by the President on April 12, in Uruguay, and became Public Law No. 90-10.

§ 9.24 The Speaker stated, in recognizing a Member for a unanimous-consent request to consider a bill, that if any amendments were offered he would ask the Member to withdraw the request and to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill because of the vital importance that the bill pass immediately and without amendment.

On July 5, 1943,⁽¹⁴⁾ Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, recognized a Member for a unanimous-consent request:

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER
FOR WAR PURPOSES

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell].

MR. [JOHN D.] DINGELL: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill

(S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The House discussed the bill under the reservation of the right to object, and the Speaker then answered a parliamentary inquiry as follows:

MR. [FREDERICK C.] SMITH of Ohio: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. SMITH of Ohio: It is my understanding this bill will be read and will be subject to amendment, providing there is no objection to its consideration under the unanimous-consent request.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman is correct, it would be subject to amendment, but the Chair is going to be very frank with the gentleman. If there are going to be amendments offered to this bill the Chair will request the gentleman from Michigan to withdraw his request, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Chair thinks it vitally important that this bill pass immediately, and he thinks it should be passed without amendment. The Chair will accept the responsibility if it is put up to the Chair.

§ 10. When in Order

Rule XXVII clause 1⁽¹⁵⁾ specifies the days on which motions to suspend the rules are in order:

14. 89 CONG. REC. 7213, 7214, 78th Cong. 1st Sess.

15. *House Rules and Manual* §902 (1979).

No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present; nor shall the Speaker entertain a motion to suspend the rules except on Mondays and Tuesdays, and during the last six days of a session.⁽¹⁶⁾

The House may, however, vary the order of business (by unanimous consent, resolution, or suspension of the rules) in order to authorize the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules on days not specified in the rule.⁽¹⁷⁾ And where such a request is agreed to, the consideration of a motion to suspend the rules on the day designated, if the Speaker recognizes for that purpose, is privileged.⁽¹⁸⁾

16. The rule was amended in the 93d and 95th Congresses to afford additional days of the month for motions to suspend the rules (see § 10.1 *infra*).

The “last six days of a session” cannot be determined unless a concurrent resolution for adjournment “*sine die*” has been adopted or unless the House is within six days of the time that Congress expires pursuant to the 20th amendment to the Constitution (see §§ 10.8–10.10, *infra*).

17. See §§ 10.2–10.7, *infra*. The request may either authorize the Speaker to recognize for any motion to suspend the rules, or may designate a certain bill or bills to be affected.
18. See § 10.7, *infra*. For recognition in relation to motions to suspend the rules, see § 11, *infra*.

In the absence of an extraordinary request, the further consideration of a motion to suspend the rules which is unfinished at adjournment is in order on the next day on which motions to suspend the rules are in order.⁽¹⁹⁾ However, that regular order may be varied. For example the further consideration of a motion to suspend the rules may be made in order on a day to which all roll call votes have been postponed.⁽²⁰⁾ Or a special order may provide that a motion to suspend the rules remain the unfinished business until disposed of.⁽¹⁾

Regular Suspension Days

§ 10.1 The 93d Congress adopted rules with an amendment of Rule XXVII clause 1 to authorize the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules on the first and third Mondays of each month and on the Tuesdays immediately following those Mandays (and eliminating the distinction between committee motions and motions by Members). Further amendments were adopted in the 95th Congress.

19. See §§ 10.11, 10.12, *infra*.

20. See § 10.13, *infra*.

1. See § 10.14, *infra*.

On Jan. 3, 1973,⁽²⁾ the House adopted House Resolution 6, adopting the rules of the 92d Congress with certain amendments as the rules of the 93d Congress. One of the amendments changed Rule XXVII clause 1, on motions to suspend the rules:

In Rule XXVII, clause 1 is amended to read as follows:

"No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present; nor shall the Speaker entertain a motion to suspend the rules except on the first and third Mondays of each month, and on the Tuesdays immediately following those days, and during the last six days of a session."⁽³⁾

Prior to the adoption of the resolution, the Majority Leader discussed, in answer to opposition from the minority, the reason for the change in the suspension rule:

MR. [Thomas P.] O'NEILL [Jr., of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I am truly amazed that there is so much opposition from the other side. I thought if there were really going to be any debate on this floor today, it would probably be on the policy of the war. I did not think we would debate a matter of this type.

We are discussing two bills. One is whether or not we would have 2 extra suspension days in the month. Why

did we offer this particular rules change? We offered it because we thought it was good reform. This change is no secret to the Members assembled here today. The newspapers have been writing about it; various organizations who want to reform the Congress have also been discussing the proposal. They have complained because on one day we had 46 suspension bills, which made for a long night session.

Is this a way to legislate? Why should we not have quit at 8 o'clock that night and brought up the remaining suspensions the next day?

That is what we have in mind. That is what we would like to do. We do not want to go until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning.

How does a bill get on the Suspension Calendar, the gentleman from New Hampshire wants to know. I am sure the minority leader knows. Although the chairman of the committee goes to the Speaker, he always clears the legislation with the minority member of the committee.⁽⁴⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: Prior to its amendment in the 93d Congress, Rule XXVII clause 1 read as follows:

No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present; nor shall the Speaker entertain a motion to suspend the rules except on the first and third Mondays of each month, preference being given on the first Monday to individuals and on the third

2. 119 CONG. REC. 17-26, 93d Cong. 1st Sess.

3. *House Rules and Manual* §902 (1973).

4. 119 CONG. REC. 21, 93d Cong. 1st Sess.

Monday to committees, and during the last six days of a session.

This clause of the rule was further amended in the 95th Congress to authorize the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules on every Monday and Tuesday. H. Res. 5, 95th Cong. 1st Sess., Jan. 4, 1977.

§ 10.2 The applicable rule (Rule XXVII clause 1) specifies the days of the month on which the motion is in order; however, by unanimous consent, it may be made in order for the Speaker to recognize a Member or Members on any given day to move to suspend the rules and pass a bill or bills.

On July 28, 1959,⁽⁵⁾ the House agreed to a request making in order a motion to suspend the rules:

MR. [CLARENCE] CANNON [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the Chair to recognize me to move to suspend the rules and pass a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the month of August.

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁶⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

On Feb. 7, 1966,⁽⁷⁾ a similar unanimous-consent request was agreed to:

MR. [CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on any day this week other than today for the Speaker to recognize a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12563) to provide for participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank, a bill which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

THE SPEAKER: ⁽⁸⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that granting this unanimous-consent request would enable the House to take up under suspension of the rules perhaps tomorrow a bill to create a brand new international bank to go along with the existing multiplicity of international banks and other lending agencies? I am one of those Members of the House who has never seen a copy of the bill. I have had no opportunity to read the hearings or to know anything about the bill. Yet the bill would embark the United States upon the expenditure of perhaps billions of dollars.

MR. ALBERT: This, of course, would not preclude the gentleman from reading the bill or the report, because I have specifically requested that consideration of the bill not be made in order until tomorrow or some later day in the week.

5. 105 CONG. REC. 14475, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

6. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

7. 112 CONG. REC. 2292, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

8. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

A similar request was agreed to on April 10, 1967:⁽⁹⁾

MR. [CARL] ALBERT [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow or Wednesday for the Speaker to recognize, under suspension of rules, a motion or joint resolution covering the subject matter of extending the period for making no change in conditions under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁰⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

MR. GERALD R. FORD [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, as I understand it, the need and necessity for such action is predicated on the possibility that if such action is not taken affirmatively, the Nation could be faced with a very critical and very serious rail strike beginning 1 minute after midnight this coming Wednesday. Is that correct?

MR. ALBERT: The gentleman is correct.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

THE SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Another such request was made on Aug. 9, 1972:⁽¹¹⁾

9. 113 CONG. REC. 8729, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.

10. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

11. 118 CONG. REC. 27532, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

MR. [JOHN J.] MCFALL [of California]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII, it shall be in order for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules on Monday, August 14, 1972.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Varying Suspension Days

§ 10.3 The House by resolution may authorize the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules on a day other than that provided by Rule XXVII.

On Aug. 21, 1961,⁽¹³⁾ objection was made to a unanimous-consent request relating to the order of business, and the same objective was therefore accomplished by the adoption of a resolution (under suspension of the rules):

MR. [JOHN W.] MCCORMACK [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on Tuesday, August 22, 1961, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules.

In making this unanimous-consent request I might say that Nos. 17 and 19 on today's program will not be subject to that unanimous-consent request.

12. Carl Albert (Okla.).

13. 107 CONG. REC. 16562, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁴⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? . . .

Objection is heard.

MR. MCCORMACK: Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 422.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time on Tuesday, August 22, 1961, to entertain motions to suspend the rules.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution?

§ 10.4 The Speaker has been authorized to recognize for suspensions during the remainder of the session.

On Sept. 11, 1959,⁽¹⁵⁾ the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request relating to the order of business for the remainder of the session:

MR. [JOHN W.] MCCORMACK [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order during the remainder of this session of Congress to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII; that reports from the Committee on Rules may be considered at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 22 of rule XI; for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to

the call of the Chair; and for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII.

§ 10.5 By unanimous consent, the Speaker was given authority to recognize for motions to suspend the rules and pass certain bills on a date to be agreed upon by himself and the Majority and Minority Leaders.

On Aug. 17, 1964,⁽¹⁶⁾ the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request made by the Majority Leader:

MR. [CARL] ALBERT [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules and pass the bills remaining undisposed of on the whip notice today on a day to be agreed upon by the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁷⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? . . .

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that if arrangements can be worked out on this or any other bill, through a unanimous-consent request, where the matter has been carefully screened, the Chair will be glad to recognize for that purpose. That does not mean today. It means sometime this week, if it is

14. Carl Albert (Okla.).

15. 105 CONG. REC. 19128, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

16. 110 CONG. REC. 19943, 19944, 88th Cong. 2d Sess.

17. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

carefully screened through the leadership. Members are protected in the knowledge that the screening has taken place.

§ 10.6 The Speaker has been authorized, by unanimous consent, to recognize for motions to suspend the rules and pass certain bills listed on the whip notice but not reached on the regular suspension day.

On Dec. 15, 1969,⁽¹⁸⁾ the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request put by the Majority Leader:

MR. [CARL] ALBERT [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday, December 16, 1969—that is tomorrow—for the Speaker to recognize motions to suspend the rules and pass the bills beginning with No. 11 listed on the whip notice of December 12, 1969.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁹⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [OF IOWA]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that there would be no additions of any nature to the list of suspensions?

MR. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct; it means No. 11 through No. 22 printed on the whip's notice.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

18. 115 CONG. REC. 39046, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

19. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

THE SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

§ 10.7 Where a Member sought recognition to call up District of Columbia business on the fourth Monday (privileged under Rule XXIV clause 8) and another Member sought recognition to move to suspend the rules and agree to a joint resolution amending the Constitution (privileged pursuant to a unanimous-consent agreement making it in order on the fourth Monday for the Speaker to recognize Members to move suspension and passage of bills), the Speaker recognized for the motion to suspend the rules, the matters being of equal privilege.

On Aug. 27, 1962,⁽²⁰⁾ which was the fourth Monday of the month and therefore a day eligible for District of Columbia business, under Rule XXIV clause 8, Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, recognized Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York, to move to suspend the rules and pass a joint resolution (to amend the Constitution to prohibit the use of a poll tax as a qualification for voting)

20. 108 CONG. REC. 17654, 176.55, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

pursuant to a previous unanimous consent request making in order on that day motions to suspend the rules. The Speaker overruled a point of order against prior recognition for the motion to suspend the rules:

MR. CELLER: Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 29, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications of electors.

MR. [THOMAS G.] ABERNETHY [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his point of order.

MR. ABERNETHY: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is District Day, that there are District bills on the calendar, and as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia I respectfully demand recognition so that these bills may be considered.

MR. [CARL] ALBERT [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is prepared to rule, but the gentleman may be heard.

MR. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, suspensions were transferred to this day, and under the rules the Speaker has power of recognition at his own discretion.

MR. ABERNETHY: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of the chairman to clause 8, rule XXIV, page 432 of the House Manual. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I submit that rule is clear that when the time is claimed

and the opportunity is claimed the Chair shall permit those bills to be considered.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit my point of order is well taken, and that I should be permitted to call up bills which are now pending on the calendar from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MR. [HOWARD W.] SMITH of Virginia: Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will hear the gentleman.

MR. SMITH of Virginia: Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House on some things are very clear, and the rules of the House either mean something or they do not mean anything.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy], has just called to the Chair's attention clause 8 of rule XXIV. Nothing could be clearer; nothing could be more mandatory. I want to repeat it because I hope the Chair will not fall into an error on this proposition:

The second and fourth Mondays in each month, after the disposition of motions to discharge committees and after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only—

And that is all; that is all that you can consider—disposition of motions to discharge committees—

and after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only—

That is all that the Chair is permitted to consider.

Mr. Speaker, after that is done the day—

shall when claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia,

be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by said committee.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the majority leader bases his defense upon the theory that the House having given unanimous consent to hear suspensions on this Monday instead of last Monday when they should have been heard—and I doubt if very many Members were here when that consent order was made and I am quite sure that a great number of them had no notice that it was going to be made, and certainly I did not—now the majority leader undertakes to say that having gotten unanimous consent to consider this motion on this day to suspend the rules, therefore, it gives the Speaker carte blanche authority to do away with the rule which gives first consideration to District of Columbia matters.

Mr. Speaker, there was no waiver of the rule on the District of Columbia. That consent did not dispose or dispense with the business on the District of Columbia day. The rule is completely mandatory. The rule says that on the second and fourth Mondays, if the District of Columbia claims the time, that the Speaker shall recognize them for such dispositions as they desire to call.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is prepared to rule.

Several days ago on August 14 unanimous consent was obtained to transfer the consideration of business under suspension of the rules on Monday last until today. That does not prohibit the consideration of a privileged motion and a motion to suspend the rules today is a privileged motion. The mat-

ter is within the discretion of the Chair as to the matter of recognition.

Last Six Days of Session

§ 10.8 Pursuant to Rule XXVII clause 1, it is in order during the last six days of a session for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules.

On Dec. 30, 1970,⁽¹⁾ Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, recognized a Member to move to suspend the rules and pass a bill; the House agreed to the motion. Although Dec. 30 was not a first or third Monday of the month under Rule XXVII clause 1, it was within six days of the end of the session and motions to suspend the rules were therefore in order.⁽²⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: Although a resolution providing for adjournment *sine die* had not yet been adopted, the term of a session of Congress automatically expires at noon on Jan. 3 pursuant to section 1 of the 20th amendment to the U. S. Constitution

§ 10.9 The provisions of Rule XXVII clause 1, which confer authority upon the Speaker

1. 116 CONG. REC. 44170, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.
2. Rule XXVII Clause 1, *House Rules and Manual* §902 (1979).

to entertain motions to suspend the rules during the last six days of a session, are not applicable until both Houses have agreed to a concurrent resolution fixing a sine die adjournment date for the Congress (or until the final six days of a session under the Constitution).

On Oct. 3, 1972,⁽³⁾ Speaker Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, indicated in response to a parliamentary inquiry that the last six days of a session, during which suspension motions are in order, cannot be determined until an adjournment resolution is passed:

MR. GERALD R. FORD [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Is it not within the prerogative of the House to pass a resolution with a date certain and send it to the other body?

THE SPEAKER: It is in the prerogative of the House to pass a resolution setting a date certain, but it is not within the prerogative of the Speaker to recognize for suspensions of rules until that sine die resolution passes the other body.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: To clarify, the House can pass such a resolution with a date certain?

THE SPEAKER: Yes, the House could; but it would not be operable until agreed to by the Senate.

§ 10.10 The Speaker was authorized to recognize for suspensions from a Wednesday for the remainder of that week (just prior to adjournment sine die).

On Aug. 26, 1957,⁽⁴⁾ a unanimous-consent request was agreed to:

MR. [JOHN W.] McCORMACK [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Consent Calendar to be called on Wednesday next, and that it also be in order for the Speaker to recognize on Wednesday next and the balance of the week for suspension of the rules.

THE SPEAKER: ⁽⁵⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Unfinished Business

§ 10.11 A motion to suspend the rules remaining undisposed of at adjournment, after the conclusion of debate on one suspension day, goes over as unfinished business to the next suspension day.

3. 118 CONG. REC. 33501, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

4. 103 CONG. REC. 15968, 85th Cong. 1st Sess.

5. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

On Aug. 5, 1935,⁽⁶⁾ Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, announced, on a suspension day, the order of business as to an unfinished motion to suspend the rules coming over from a previous suspension day:

THE SPEAKER: When the House adjourned on the last suspension day there was under consideration the bill (S. 2865) to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. This motion is, therefore, the unfinished business, as the Chair understands debate was concluded on the measure.

On Feb. 8, 1931, the House ordered a second on a motion to suspend the rules and then adjourned before concluding debate on the motion. The motion was resumed as unfinished business on the next day, Feb. 9, which was an eligible day for suspensions under Rule XXVII, the House being within the last six days of the session.⁽⁷⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: Where a portion of the 40 minutes of debate (20 minutes for each side) has been used on a motion to sus-

pend the rules, and the House then adjourns, debate is resumed where it left off when the motion comes up as unfinished business.⁽⁸⁾

§ 10.12 A motion to suspend the rules on which a second had been ordered, remaining undisposed of at adjournment as the unfinished business, was, on the next day when such motion was again in order, withdrawn by unanimous consent.

On May 5, 1958,⁽⁹⁾ which was a day when motions to suspend the rules were in order, Mr. Oren Harris, of Arkansas, asked unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings under suspension of the rules held two weeks prior on H.R. 11414, to amend the Public Health Service Act (on the prior occasion, a second had been ordered on the bill but the House had adjourned before completing its consideration). The unanimous-consent request was agreed to, and Mr. Harris moved to suspend the rules and pass the same bill with amendments.

§ 10.13 Pursuant to a special order postponing roll calls

6. 79 CONG. REC. 12506, 74th Cong. 1st Sess. the rules coming over from a previous suspension day:

7. 74 CONG. REC. 6577, 71st Cong. 3d Sess.

8. See § 13.2, *infra*.

9. 104 CONG. REC. 8004, 85th Cong. 2d Sess.

until the following Thursday, consideration of the vote on a bill called up under suspension of the rules was postponed and made the unfinished business on the day when roll calls would again be in order.

On Oct. 5, 1965,⁽¹⁰⁾ Mr. Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill; when Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, put the question on the motion, Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present. The Speaker then stated as follows:

THE SPEAKER: Pursuant to the order of the House of October 1, further proceedings on the Senate joint resolution will go over until Thursday, October 7.

The postponement of the vote on the motion to suspend the rules was carried as follows in the House Journal:

On a division, demanded by Mr. Gross, there appeared—yeas 55, nays 12.

Mr. Gross objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and not voting and made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

10. 111 CONG. REC. 25944, 89th Cong. 1st Sess.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE S.J. RES. 106

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of October 1, 1965, further consideration of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution of the Senate, S.J. Res. 106 was postponed until Thursday, October 7, 1965.

Mr. Gross then withdrew his point of no quorum.⁽¹¹⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: On Oct. 1, the House had agreed to a unanimous-consent request that all roll call votes, other than on matters of procedure, which might arise on Oct. 5 or 6, be put over until Oct. 7.⁽¹²⁾

§ 10.14 The House, under a motion to suspend the rules, passed a resolution extending the time for debate on a motion to suspend the rules, and making said motion the unfinished business until disposed of.

On Sept. 20, 1943,⁽¹³⁾ a resolution providing for the consideration of a motion to suspend the rules was itself brought up and

11. H. Jour. 1256, 1257, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., Oct. 5, 1965.

12. 111 CONG. REC. 25796, 25797, 89th Cong. 1st Sess.

13. 89 CONG. REC. 7646–55, 78th Cong. 1st Sess.

passed under suspension of the rules:

MR. [JOHN W.] McCORMACK [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 302), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the time for debate on a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 25 shall be extended to 4 hours, such time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and said motion to suspend the rules shall be the continuing order of business of the House until finally disposed of.

Varying Suspension Days by Special Order

§ 10.15 Form of unanimous-consent request that the Speaker may recognize Members to move to suspend the rules at any time until an adjournment to a day certain.

On July 2, 1943,⁽¹⁴⁾ a unanimous-consent request was made, as follows:

MR. [JOHN W.] McCORMACK: [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules at any time between now and the time that the House takes its recess.

14. 89 CONG. REC. 7038, 78th Cong. 1st Sess.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁵⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

§ 10.16 Form of resolution providing that at any time on a certain day it shall be in order for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules notwithstanding Rule XXVII clause 1.

On May 25, 1946,⁽¹⁶⁾ the following resolution reported from the Committee on Rules was called up for consideration and adopted by the House:

Resolved, That at any time on Saturday, May 25, 1946, or Monday, May 27, 1946, it shall be in order for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII.⁽¹⁷⁾

§ 11. Recognition to Offer

The Speaker is authorized but not required to recognize for motions to suspend the rules on eligible days, and recognition for such motions is entirely within the discretion of the Speaker.⁽¹⁸⁾ The re-

15. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

16. 92 CONG. REC. 5746, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

17. *House Rules and Manual* §902 (1979).

18. See §§11.3–11.7, *infra*. For discussion of the Speaker's power of rec-